

From: [Scott Couch](#)
To: [Billington, Tracie; Jeffrey Albrecht; JANET BLAKE; Shahla Farahnak;](#)
CC:
Subject: Fwd: FW: Monte Rio Sewer Funding.
Date: Friday, December 08, 2006 4:38:31 PM
Attachments:

Here is a repeat from an earlier message.

Scott B. Couch, P.G.
State Water Board - Div. of Financial Assistance
1001 "I" Street, 16th Fl., Sacramento, CA 95814
916-341-5658, scouch@waterboards.ca.gov

>>> <[REDACTED]> 12/8/2006 12:49 PM >>>

Mr. Couch;

Reforwarding for consideration a letter I sent to you and the Waterboard on 04/08/06.

J. Bauer

----- Forwarded Message: -----

From: [REDACTED]

To: info@swrcb.ca.gov, BEvoy@waterboards.ca.gov, MFong@waterboards.ca.gov,
abaggett@waterboards.ca.gov, PSilva@waterboards.ca.gov, CCantu@waterboards.ca.gov,
JMarshall@waterboards.ca.gov, DPolhemus@waterboards.ca.gov, DKirn@waterboards.ca.gov,
WPierson@waterboards.ca.gov, BBrock@waterboards.ca.gov,
PKeiran@waterboards.ca.gov, ESpiess@waterboards.ca.gov, SFarahnak@waterboards.ca.gov,
RDuff@waterboards.ca.gov, DFA_grants@waterboards.ca.gov,
stalanki@waterboards.ca.gov, TracieB@waterboards.ca.gov, Jvun@waterboards.ca.gov,
Rsvetich@waterboards.ca.gov, Rkatz@waterboards.ca.gov, Tdoduc@waterboards.ca.gov,
Gsecundy@waterboards.ca.gov, scouch@waterboards.ca.gov, vsilva@waterboards.ca.gov,
jbarnickol@waterboards.ca.gov, rbosworth@waterboards.ca.gov,
tthompson@waterboards.ca.gov, ckuhlman@waterboards.ca.gov, jshort@waterboards.ca.gov,
mdougherty@waterboards.ca.gov, rtancreto@waterboards.ca.gov

Subject: Monte Rio Sewer Funding.

Date: Sat, 08 Apr 2006 22:20:29 +0000

> CC: SWRCB.

> The SWRCB as participating State funders and the RWQCB (Santa Rosa staff) as

> project endorsers should be paying close attention to all the ongoing

> manipulations. This project is a continuing embarrassment on multi levels. Your
> Agency for whatever reason seems to see, hear, smell no evil!
>
>
> April 6, 2006.
> To: USDA CA.
> Attn: Ben Higgins, Janice Waddell, Tenna Hungate, Al Aiello, Greg Aanestad.
>
> Dear USDA;
> This is a followup message to previous correspondence. Below is forwarded the
> latest Sonoma County spin printed in the Sonoma West Times. A similiar article
> was also recently printed in the Press Democrat. The County Deputy Counsel
> recently quoted \$14.7M as the latest high level but theres no need to quibble.
> It's going to go even higher.
>
> Mr. Walker's claim that Hurricane Katrina has added \$2.M to the costs in one
> year is a ludicrous distortion to further screen incompetence and malfeasance
> spanning 9 plus years. See my correspondence to you dated 03/24/06.
>
> Now \$14.5-7M and counting. \$7.6M when announced in 1998 (+93%). \$11.0M
> in 2003, as the basis for the Prop 218 vote. \$12.5M in August 2005 creating
> necessity for a Prop 218 protest procedure. And now it's 22% over that;
> approaching an average \$37,000 per property (400) and still to increase. All
> previous outside funding having been solicited using those bogus understated
> numbers.
>
> And they now desparately need more free (other peoples) public money. I direct
> your attention and all other potential funders to California Public Utility Code
> Section 12842. "No district shall incur and indebtedness for public works which
> in the aggregate exceeds 20 percent of the assessed value of all real and
> personal property within the district."
>
> In addition to the excessive cost average approaching \$37K per property (most
> old buildings built as summer cabins), a citizen ratepayer researched in Sept
> 2005 the districts assessed value was \$55,376,481. Total cost now 26+% of
> assessed value and rising. This could be further exacerbated by the fact Mr.
> Walker and Supervisor Reilly proclaimed Nov. 2005 at a community meeting that if
> they didn't have enough funds, they'd get this off the ground by connecting only
> the North side of town and sort out the rest later. Total chutzpa. Much like
> Reillys attempt to start project construction at Sheridans before the court
> appointed eminent domain date. He fortunately was rebuked on that. They still

> haven't negotiated or confiscated the property.
>
> USDA CA. should not be funding or participating in this manipulated pork
> boondoggle. All of the above substantiates my previous correspondence to you.
> The USDA funds would be far better served elsewhere. Perhaps those who are
> following blindly and refuse to ask questions could be transferred to FEMA.
>
> Sincerely; John Bauer
>
> ----- Forwarded Message: -----
> Subject: Sewer news in Sonoma West Times
> Date: Mon, 3 Apr 2006 15:49:31 +0000
> > County still committed to Monte Rio sewer system
> >
> > by Frank Robertson - Sonoma West Staff Writer
> > MONTE RIO - County officials this week issued a
> > renewed commitment to completing the Monte Rio sewage
> > project whose construction costs are now projected to
> > exceed \$14.5 million and climbing.
> >
> > Latest figures show the Monte Rio project costs are up
> > by more than \$2 million, said Ted Walker of the county
> > Permit and Resource Management Department.
> >
> > "Materials prices are up. It's about \$2 million
> > higher" than projected last year, said Walker.
> >
> > Since the Hurricane Katrina and Rita disasters, "The
> > price of concrete, metal, sewer pipe is all up.
> > Transportation costs are up," said Walker this week,
> > as county supervisors sent off a formal commitment
> > letter telling federal grant and loan agencies that
> > the Monte Rio project is nevertheless on track.
> >
> > A commitment letter was necessary to secure federal
> > grant and loan funds that otherwise were at risk of
> > being reallocated, said Walker.
> >
> > Even with Monte Rio's cost now exceeding grant and
> > loan commitments, "We intend to put the project out to
> > bid in next few months," said Walker, the county

> > environmental health specialist in charge of the Monte
> > Rio project.

> >

> > Other grant funding sources are being sought to cover
> > the projected \$2.2 million shortfall.

> >

> > "The county intends for us to get additional grants to
> > cover that," said Walker. "We don't want it to go to
> > the ratepayers."

> >

> > Ratepayers are now looking at a projected annual tax
> > bill of approximately \$1,200 per single-family
> > dwelling to cover debt service, operations and
> > maintenance if and when the system is completed.

> >

> > Property owners began seeing a sewer fee of \$334 per
> > single-family dwelling on this year's tax bill to
> > service existing debt and repay county loans.

> >

> > The Monte Rio project last year had been estimated to
> > cost approximately \$12.5 million, up from an \$11
> > million estimate in 2003 when voters approved it.
> > Funding sources are a mix of state grants, a U.S.
> > Department of Agriculture (USDA) grant and a USDA
> > loan, and a \$3 million sewer bond. A total of seven
> > state and federal grants have been approved for the
> > Monte Rio project, said Walker.

> >

> > Approximately \$367,000 of the new shortfall can be
> > made up by increasing the USDA loan without increasing
> > user rates, said Walker in a report to the board.

> >

> > That leaves a gap of approximately \$1.8 million for
> > which "additional sources of funds must be
> > identified," Walker told the board.

> >

> > Last year West County Supervisor Mike Reilly asked the
> > Russian River Redevelopment Oversight Committee
> > (RRROC) to recommend some redevelopment cash for the
> > Monte Rio system. RRROC members, sitting on
> > approximately \$1.75 million in uncommitted

> > redevelopment money, voiced mixed support but took no
> > action on the request. There has been no further
> > discussion, at least officially, of using
> > redevelopment funds to help complete the Monte Rio
> > system, said RRROC chairman Dan Fein.
> >
> > "It's a moot point for us at this point," said Fein.
> >
> > "The general sense I get from RRROC is there is
> > nothing to talk about until the project is happening."
> >
> > Walker didn't rule out another bid for redevelopment
> > support but said that would be Mike Reilly's decision.
> >
> > "The county is definitely going after additional
> > grants," to cover the latest shortfall, said Walker.
> > "We don't want to raise anyone's rates" higher than
> > they are now.
> >
>
>
>
>